

Kissinger/Brezhnev Bury Détente in Moscow

Nixon Beefs Up Pentagon War Arsenal

Commenting on the current state of the U.S.-USSR détente *The Wall Street Journal* sarcastically observed last month: "Except that we're not hurling warheads at each other, which was also a blessed condition of the Cold War, it does seem that détente these days seems to mean Mr. Brezhnev won't mention Watergate and Mr. Nixon won't mention the Gulag Archipelago." (*Wall Street Journal*, 19 March).

Scarcely nine months ago Nixon and Brezhnev were clinking champagne glasses in Washington, toasting the latest Soviet-American accord—an agreement that each side would try to avert military confrontations that could lead to nuclear war between the U.S. and USSR or any other country. This agreement, like most of the "atmosphere of détente" has evaporated, a casualty of the recent Near East War. The crowning blow to this accord was Nixon's order for a world-wide alert of U.S. military units in October, allegedly called in response to an imminent Soviet intervention on behalf of the beleaguered Egyptian armies.

The latest rebuff to the "peaceful coexistence" illusions of the Stalinists, revealing the fundamentally phony nature of the Nixon/Brezhnev détente, is to be found in the military policies that the chief architect of détente, Richard M. Nixon, is currently advocating to the U.S. bourgeoisie. Nixon's proposals, including a record \$85.8 billion defense budget (plus \$6.8 billion for long-term Pentagon contracts, plus another \$6.2 billion to supplement the current defense budget and pay for the replacement of \$2.2 billion in weapons and munitions sent to Israel during the recent Near East War), starkly reveal the undying hostility of U.S. imperialism to the Soviet degenerated workers state, Kissinger or no Kissinger.

SALT

In effect, Nixon's latest proposals amount to tearing up another scrap of paper that was supposed to be a historic monument to détente and peaceful coexistence, the 1972 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I). SALT I was an agreement between the U.S. and the USSR to set a five-year limit on the number of offensive missiles each side could have. The U.S. was to have a ceiling of 1,054 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and 44 missile-launching submarines with 710 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). The USSR was to have 1,618



Brezhnev and Nixon in Washington, June 1973.

ICBMs and 62 submarines with 950 SLBMs.

The U.S. bourgeoisie was willing to agree to this position of seeming numerical inferiority, despite the fact that the payloads of the Soviet missiles were up to 120 percent greater than those of the Americans, because SALT I set no restrictions on the number of warheads each rocket could carry. By 1975 the U.S. expected half of its missiles to be tipped with very high-accuracy multiple independently targeted warheads (MIRVs) that can hit widely separated, pre-plotted targets. The Russians had no MIRV capacity in 1972, and Pentagon planners expected it would take five years for the USSR to develop such a capability. Consequently the U.S. missile force, while numerically smaller than the Soviet force, can deliver 7,100 warheads to the Soviet Union's 3,300.

Moreover, SALT I placed no limits on long-range bombers (the U.S. has 440, the USSR has only 140), medium-range missiles and "tactical" nuclear weapons. American planes based in West Europe and on aircraft carriers are capable of striking deep into the Soviet Union, while the Russians lack an analogous capacity. Thus the effective nuclear advantage of the U.S. is considerably greater than the above-stated relation of 7,100 to 2,300.

This hegemony in nuclear weaponry the Pentagon prefers to term "a rough balance" of nuclear forces. But the successful development of MIRV capacity by the USSR in August of last year

has unexpectedly upset this nuclear détente. If the more numerous Soviet missiles with their greater throw-weight were equipped with MIRVs, the present American advantage could possibly be erased.

The Great Kissinger Flops in Moscow

The response of the Nixon government to this new Soviet "threat" has been very quick. Kissinger was sent to Moscow to discuss a new SALT treaty. There he magnanimously offered to halt further deployment of MIRV missiles, conditional on the Soviet Union's doing the same. If this could not be accomplished, Kissinger reportedly insisted that a new accord equalize the total throw-weight of MIRV missiles, while not limiting the payloads of long-range bombers or single-warhead missiles. Kissinger also called for equalizing the total number of strategic missiles and bombers on each side.

Clearly this proposal has as many loopholes in it as a stock deal concocted by Robert Vesco. So it was not surprising that Kissinger was sent home empty-handed. These SALT negotiations are simply an elaborate charade in the most elegant tradition of bourgeois hypocrisy and diplomatic horse-trading. It is a measure both of the cynicism and stupidity of the Kremlin misleaders that they pretend that this farce has anything at all to

continued on page 11



U.S. Minuteman missile.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Chile After the Coup...2

Lessons of the Lip Strike...6

CLUW Conference: Bureaucracy and Tokenism...8

Chile After the Coup

Last September 11 the Chilean armed forces toppled President Salvador Allende's "Popular Unity" (UP) coalition government in order, they claimed, to "avoid violence and lead the Chilean people along the road to peace." The junta announced its aim as "the liberation of the country from the Marxist yoke"; however, "the workers of Chile may be certain that the economic and social benefits they have achieved to the present will not suffer fundamental change" (*New York Times*, 12 September 1973). But while piously proclaiming that there would be "no victors and no vanquished," the *gorilla* officers proceeded to reduce real wages by more than 50 percent through astronomical inflation, drastically increase the work week and massacre more than 20,000 workers and socialist militants.

The September coup was probably the bloodiest in Latin American history. Far from being a mere palace revolt, it was directed at smashing the large and combative workers movement. Factories which resisted the military takeover were bombed; after surrendering, any workers present during the fighting were shot on the spot. The CUT labor federation was abolished and all leftist parties outlawed. Moreover, the coup was endorsed by virtually the entire bourgeoisie—including the supposedly "progressive" Christian Democrats (CDP)—and most of the middle class as well.

But a scant half year later, the junta now appears increasingly unstable, with reports of internal rifts, opposition from the Christian Democrats and the Catholic hierarchy, universal hatred in the working class and widespread discontent in the petty bourgeoisie and even sectors of the ruling class. Internationally it has managed to achieve a position of isolation rivaled only by Rhodesia.

The first duty of a revolutionary is to call things by their right names. It must be recognized that the workers movement suffered a tragic and costly defeat with the September coup in Chile. Thousands of militants murdered, the unions and left parties outlawed, driven underground and at least partially disorganized—this is not, as some maintain, a mere "detour" on the "Chilean road to socialism." Responsibility for the bloodbath lies with U.S. imperialism, the Chilean bourgeoisie and with the reformist leadership of the workers movement which lulled the masses by preaching confidence in the "democratic" military.

However, despite the best efforts of the junta's butchers, the generals' Chile is not Nazi Germany. The military regime remains in power solely through brute military force. Pinochet and Co. have nothing of the fascist mass movement behind them which enabled Hitler and Mussolini to decapitate and literally obliterate the workers movement. The junta cannot last. This means that Chilean workers will have an opportunity rarely afforded by history—a second chance for socialist revolution in the not-distant future. What is needed, above all, to turn this possibility into a reality is a genuine Trotskyist party which will draw the lessons of the ignominious defeat of the Allende regime and begin the political rearming of the working class.

It is necessary to drive home to socialist militants and the working masses that the death and destruction wreaked by the September coup were the product of the Stalinists' and social democrats' counterrevolutionary policies of "peaceful transition to socialism" and "popular front" with sectors of the bourgeoisie. The UP regime was not a workers government (which would immediately undertake to crush the class enemy by expropriating the bourgeoisie and destroying its armed

forces) but rather a class-collaborationist "people's government," whose main purpose was to prevent the independent mobilization of the workers.

The Allende regime paved the way for the coup. Therefore, to simply "continue the struggle," to fight to replace the junta with a new version of the "Popular Unity," is to prepare yet another defeat, this time one of catastrophic proportions. Chilean socialists must inscribe on their banners, "Death to the Junta! No Popular-Front Illusions—For a Workers and Peasants Revolution!" Without this perspective, *nothing* will have been gained from the deaths of thousands of militants martyred on the altar of the "non-violent road to socialism." As Marx pointed out, those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

War on the Working Class

If the bonapartist military regime has been unable to atomize the working class, it has not been for lack of trying. Immediately upon taking power it unleashed an avalanche of decrees declaring a state of siege (no. 3), state of emergency (no. 4) and state of internal war (no. 6); authorizing immediate execution if units of the armed forces are fired on (no. 5, article 2) or in the case of the discovery of a weapon "when the circumstances or antecedents permit the supposition that the weapon was intended to disturb public order or attack the armed forces..." (no. 5, article 3).

During the crucial first weeks after the coup the new regime made great efforts to create a temporary prosperity by ordering immediate payment of salaries, announcing draconian measures against anyone charging more than the official price for the main essential goods, unloading on the market stocks of "luxury" goods which had been hoarded for months (Nescafé, cream, sugar, beef, cigarettes, etc.) and ending the truck owners' work stoppage which had paralyzed the country for the last six weeks. However, this euphoric condition lasted about three weeks. The junta then published

Workers Resist

While executing thousands of militant workers and firing additional thousands of suspected leftists, the junta has been unable to totally extinguish working-class resistance. The 22 February *Rouge* reports a number of strikes, including a one-hour work stoppage by workers at the Sumar textile factory protesting the expulsion of the Swedish ambassador, a strike at the IRT factory at the beginning of January because of non-payment of legally required wage increases, and a wave of "absenteeism" at Santiago bakeries at the end of the month. While these are only timid beginnings, they presage future strikes as the junta's power weakens and real wages continue to plummet.

another decree freeing all prices from government controls while rigidly freezing workers' wages. The five-day week was abolished, a half day added on Saturdays and employers were given the "option" to "propose" an additional two hours a day (*Rouge*, 23 November 1973).

The inflation in particular has brutally reduced the consumption of the working masses. The more than 300 percent annual rate of price increase during Allende's last months was a principal cause for petty-bourgeois discontent with the UP government. Now, however, the masses are faced with a rate which is double to triple



General Augusto Pinochet, head of the Chile junta.

that already astronomical level (many items have gone up more than 1,000 percent since the coup) combined with rigid freezing of salaries. According to the *New York Times* (5 November 1973), "Radios blare the new slogan, 'The party is over, now it's time to pay the bill'." Capturing the flavor of the new regime, Economics Minister Fernando Leniz remarked on television, "housewives must learn to buy. If the free prices are too high, it is better not to consume for a while" (*Rouge*, 30 November 1973).

Discontent in the Bourgeoisie

The military plotters and their Pentagon backers clearly had in mind a "Brazilian-style" junta, combining a rigidly authoritarian government with *laissez-faire* economic policies to produce a boom based on foreign investment. The generals did their part, denationalizing hundreds of factories, driving down real wages, crushing the unions, etc. The U.S. banks immediately chipped in some \$180 million to the now "low-risk" government (*New York Times*, 12 November 1973); the International Monetary Fund has granted the new regime "stand-by" credits to cover balance of payments deficits. The junta has agreed to "compensate" the American mining companies for their "losses" due to nationalization of Chilean copper under Allende, and the companies, in turn, are now providing technical aid. And yet the government now announces that 1974 will be "the worst year in the history of Chile," calling on the population to perform still more "sacrifices" (*Tricontinental News Service*, 13 March).

According to official figures, the gross product for the period from the September coup to the end of the year was 4 percent above the last four months of the Allende regime (*Rouge*, 22 February 1974). But the last 120

days of the UP government included a major copper miners' strike in May, occupation by the workers of more than 1,000 enterprises following the June 29 attempted coup and a six-week truck owners' stoppage in August and September. A 4 percent increase over a state of near-total economic collapse is no improvement at all.

This economic stagnation is causing considerable unease among sectors of the bourgeoisie (particularly those connected with the production of consumer goods) which had enthusiastically supported the coup and the return of nationalized and occupied factories to their former owners. In a letter to General Pinochet this January, the leaders of the CDP complained that, "The remunerations of workers barely permit them to feed themselves and in many cases do not permit them to meet the vital needs of their families" (*New York Times*, 8 February 1974). The letter contrasts this to "businesses whose profits exceed all expectations" and points out that, "Nobody can ignore the injustice of this situation and the dangers which this entails."

However, the Christian Democrats' concern is not limited to a sudden twinge of conscience over "unjust profits"—higher wages would be good business, too. Editorializing in the CDP newspaper *La Prensa*, they point out that salary increases "would stimulate production in a more effective manner" because "all the income of this immense majority goes directly to the market, to demand for goods and services, and it must be understood that this money, transformed into purchasing power, is a stimulant for production..." (quoted in *Rouge*, 1 February 1974).

Already in September the left wing of the CDP (headed by Bernardo Leighton) took a negative attitude toward the junta (without, of course, attempting any kind of active resistance). However, ex-President Eduardo Frei endorsed

the military action. Moreover, a number of prominent Christian Democrats took positions in the new government. Thus the minister of justice is a member of the CDP, as are four vice-ministers. General Arturo Bonilla, minister of the interior, has in the past been associated with officers close to the CDP.

However, the ultra-reactionary policies of the junta have dampened their earlier enthusiasm for the elimination of the UP. This does not mean that CDP leaders now oppose the military dictatorship. After asking, in an interview with General Bonilla, that the regime raise workers' wages, CDP head Patricio Alwyn sent a private memorandum to party leaders in which he noted: "We do not like it, but we concede that a period of dictatorship is necessary. But we believe that in order for it to be efficient, excesses should not be committed, and it is these excesses which we are criticizing" (*New York Times*, 8 February).

The junta, for its part, has been intensifying its pressure on the CDP. In January it issued a decree prohibiting any meetings of party leaders without prior authorization by military authorities and on the eve of its sixth month in power it issued a document stating that, "The two majority groups that led Chile into decadence—Marxism and Christian Democracy—were international movements in many respects" (*Excelsior* [Mexico], 11 March). Commenting on the increasing tensions between the CDP and the government, and within the junta itself, a U.S. business publication, *Latin America* (1 March), wrote recently:

"...the signs are that the darkening economic situation will soon require a resolution of the contradictions within the armed forces. In the short run, at least, this can only result in a strengthening of the hard-line group associated with the air force General Gustavo Leigh and Admiral Jose Toribio Merino....

"The Christian Democrats may have come to feel that things have come to such a pass that there can be no further point in collaborating with the present junta. Such a decision would have a powerful impact on Christian Democrat supporters within the army—among whom General Pinochet has often been counted."

The Left: Aftermath of the Coup

Although virtually the entire workers movement saw the inevitability of a coup after the withdrawal of the military ministers from the Allende government in late August, there were no systematic preparations to combat

it. What stocks of arms the left possessed were either not in the hands of the workers at all or were randomly distributed rather than being made available to organized self-defense groups. Moreover, on the day of the coup the CUT leadership gave the order to guard the factories and await further orders—orders which never came. Consequently, after the military had finished mopping up the government offices in the center of Santiago, it was able to trap a large number of the most militant workers in the factories where they were forced into a desperate resistance with nothing more than a few machine guns.

Of all the parties, Allende's own Socialist Party was without doubt the most affected by the coup and today hardly exists as an organization. Because of its loose structure it was apparently the most infiltrated of the left organizations. In addition, the SP was the only group which had distributed a certain number of guns to its militants in the factories. Therefore, it was often they who put up what disorganized resistance there was to the coup, and consequently it was they who suffered the largest number of casualties.

The right wing of the Socialist Party was concentrated among government officials, many of whom were at their posts at the time of the coup and were either immediately arrested or killed. According to a report of the Mexican paper *Excelsior* (28 February), "Of some 45 members of the [SP] Central Committee, only three are now active." Party chief Carlos Altamirano, now in Havana, was saved from the repression only by the efforts of the MIR.

Accounts of the situation of the Communist Party are contradictory. Clearly it is now functioning underground, in contrast to the decimated SP. However, its top leader, Luis Corvalán, was captured by the military and on September 11 CP organization and action were reportedly nil. The party's stock of arms was not in the hands of the workers, and due to the junta's 72-hour curfew there was no means of distributing them. Moreover, when the leadership decided early (about 11 a.m. on the day of the coup) to order a retreat, this was not communicated to its factory organizations even in the capital itself (according to *Rouge*, 16 November 1973, which interviewed two CP leaders underground in Chile after the coup). On the other hand, the CP youth organization is apparently functioning and is credited with organizing, on a few hours' notice, the impressive 2,000-strong demonstration at the burial of Pablo Neruda in late September.

Of all the left parties, the

Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (Revolutionary Left Movement) has reportedly best survived the severe repression. Its militants put up a limited resistance in the slum districts immediately following the coup; but by the third day the MIR leadership ordered a retreat (the only possible course under the circumstances). Having in the late 1960's made an attempt at guerrilla warfare and having predicted the coming of a coup for months, the organization was able to go underground with relative ease. However, despite their warnings and boasts of being the only group to possess a real military apparatus, these Castroist guerrillaists were unable to do anything effective to stop the military takeover.

In the area around Valdivia and Temuco in the south (where the MIR had achieved considerable support among the Mapuche Indians) the leftist peasants were forced into the hills where they have been carrying on sporadic guerrilla warfare in response to an invasion of several thousand soldiers who have carried out a sys-

d'état" (*L'Humanité*, 1 September 1973).

One would think it impossible to stoop any lower than calling on the Christian Democrats and the generals to join the government at a time when these were preparing a military coup and then blaming the putsch on the "excesses" of "ultra-leftists." Apparently not. Now the Chilean Communist Party is again calling for unity with "those Christian Democrats who have come out in opposition to the coup" as well as with the "democratic officers." However, there is a new twist: it seems that the slogan "Down with the dictatorship" is "expressing a general feeling" but "as a phrase it, by itself, is not in a position to unite the majority in a concrete mass action." Instead, the demand "end the situation of internal warfare" is "an agitational slogan...that can prepare for mass action, that will seriously unite the majority..." (*Daily World*, 16 January).

The Stalinists, of course, are past masters at the theory of two-stage revolution (first, "anti-feudal revolu-

TRIUNFO



Sumar textile factory in Santiago, scene of sharp fighting during the coup.

tematic "pacification" operation, murdering all peasant union leaders and often their families as well. The military succeeded in capturing and executing the top MIR leader in the region, "Comandante Pepe" (José Gregorio Liendo) soon after the coup but has been unable to completely crush the peasants' movement. One union leader recently reported that a clandestine congress representing 300,000 organized agricultural workers had been held in the Mapuche region (*Daily World*, 2 April). On the other hand, a top MIR leader (Bautista Van Schouwen) was captured by the government in mid-December which, like the loss of Liendo, is certainly a serious blow.

In short, while all of the groups have suffered some losses, the Socialists in particular, the junta has by no means succeeded in destroying the left parties and crushing the working class. The elements exist for beginning clandestine struggle against the military regime—the question now is, for what goals, and with what strategy and tactics.

The Left: Once Again the Popular Front

Of all the parties of the Unidad Popular, the Stalinist Communist Party was the most shameless in its policies of class collaboration with the so-called "anti-imperialist" sectors of the bourgeoisie. Until the very end the party leadership called for including the Christian Democrats in the government, putting faith in the "professionalism" of the armed forces, increasing production and holding down wages, returning occupied factories and estates to the owners, limiting the number of nationalizations, etc., while blaming the antagonism of the reactionaries to the UP government on the "adventurism" of the MIR. According to French CP leader Bernard Fajon, shortly after returning from a trip to Chile, "the ultra-leftist slogan of disobedience directed at the soldiers...has aided the efforts of the officers favorable to a coup

tion" or "advanced democracy"; later for socialism). Now a third stage ("normal" bourgeois democracy resulting from the overthrow of the "fascist" junta) and even a fourth stage (military dictatorship without the "state of internal war") have been added. The purpose of this charade is to, at all costs, avoid the independent mobilization of the workers and peasants for socialist revolution, a goal which would frighten the CP's bourgeois friends and hoped-for allies.

That the Communist Party continues to believe in a popular front is certainly no news. Instead the most significant political development since the coup is the sharp right turn of the MIR. After several years of criticizing the UP government because it refused to break sharply with the Christian Democrats, the MIR has now joined the UP parties in calling for a "broad, anti-fascist alliance" with the CDP. Having convinced the UP parties to include itself in their popular-front coalition (along with the Radicals and Christian Left), suddenly the "new MIR" adopts the same class-collaborationist orientation it had criticized for the past three years! The MIR leadership now believes that:

"The immediate objectives of the popular resistance against the dictatorship are:

"To push for a minimum platform demanding the re-establishment of democratic liberties and raising the defense of the living standards of the masses, undertaking a struggle for adjustments equal to 100 percent of the rise in the cost of living.

"To construct a political front of the anti-gorila [militarist] resistance incorporating all the forces of the left and a sector of the CDP (the democratic petty bourgeoisie)."

—MIR, "A los trabajadores, a los revolucionarios y a los pueblos del mundo," January 1974

It should be clear to anyone who has read the above paragraphs that this is precisely the policy of the Communist Party, the same policy which, as the

continued on next page



International Defense of Chilean Leftists

In recent weeks, the international Spartacist tendency has initiated a series of demonstrations calling for freedom for all victims of the junta's repression and focussing on the case of two captured leaders of the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR—Revolutionary Left Movement), Bautista Van Schouwen and Alejandro Romero. Particular emphasis on these militants was important because until now they had not even been mentioned in Chile protest demonstrations in the U.S. Additional urgency was lent by the possibility of a "deal" to save a few prominent reformist leaders such as Corvalán, an arrangement which would immediately endanger the lives of far-left militants (see "Romero and Van Schouwen Must Not Die!" WV No. 40, 15 March).

In addition to the New York protest picket (reported in the last issue) which brought together some 150 militants, demonstrations have also been held in Ann Arbor, Madison and Los Angeles in the U.S.; and in Melbourne and Sydney, Australia.

MELBOURNE: The April issue of *Australasian Spartacist* (monthly newspaper of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand) reports that "approximately 45 people attended a rally defending Van Schouwen and Romero in Civic Square on March 22. Members and supporters of the Spartacist League (SLANZ), the Communist League (CL), the Socialist Workers Action Group (SWAG) and the Socialist Workers League (SWL) attended, as well as a number of independents." While speakers from the CL, SWL and SLANZ addressed the rally, only the

Spartacist spokesman spoke of the necessity of mobilizing the Australian working class in defense of the imprisoned Chilean militants.

In addition to raising the demand of "free all Chilean political prisoners," the SLANZ called on a trade-union fact-finding commission departing for Chile to demand the release of Van Schouwen and Romero. Union and Australian Labor Party bodies and the Labor government were challenged to demand the release of Chilean political prisoners, offer them asylum in Australia and institute all possible sanctions against the junta until the prisoners are freed and martial law rescinded.

SYDNEY: The same issue of *AS* reports a March 23 demonstration in Sydney, called by the Committee for Solidarity with the Chilean People (CSCP), to send off the Chile delegation organized by the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, Plumbers Union, Miners Federation and Transport Workers Union. Among the 50 people attending the demonstration around the slogan "free all political prisoners in Chile" were supporters of the CSCP, the CL, the Communist Party (CPA), the SLANZ and individual Latin Americans.

While speakers of the other groups confined themselves to tales of horror and calls for a "broad-based" campaign involving "all progressive people" in Australia to protest the junta's repression, the SLANZ speaker at the rally explained the importance of a class/defense of the Chilean militants and the absolute necessity of assimilating the lessons of the failure of the UP coalition government.



WV PHOTO

Madison rally to defend Chilean militants.

LOS ANGELES: Approximately 70 militants participated in a united-front picket of the Chilean consulate on April 6 in defense of the two imprisoned MIR leaders and all prisoners of the junta's butchers. Active in organizing of the demonstration, in addition to the Spartacist League/Revolutionary Communist Youth, were a number of comrades from an independent black collective, 15 of whom participated in the picket. Among the organizations endorsing the demonstration called by the Committee to Defend Van Schouwen and Romero were the Black Student Union of East Los Angeles College, Hashomer Hatzair, International Socialists, the Los Angeles Group for Latin American Solidarity (LAGLAS), the Militant Caucus of AFSCME Local 2070, the Revolutionary Socialist League, the SL/RCY, MECHA at California State (North Ridge), La Vida Nueva (East L.A. College), News and Letters and the AFT organizing committee (Local 1781) at UCLA. Several individuals from the

National Committee to Free Los Tres also participated. Prominent among those refusing to support the demonstration were the Communist Party and the Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Chile which it leads.

MADISON: Nearly 40 militant workers and students participated in a spirited picket line in defense of Van Schouwen and Romero at the University of Wisconsin Madison campus on April 5. In addition, the rally after the picket attracted a crowd totalling about 100. The picket/rally had been called by the SL/RCY-initiated Committee to Free Van Schouwen and Romero, and the united-front action was endorsed by a number of Madison-area labor and left groups, including the De Mau Mau Defense Committee and the United Farm Workers Boycott Committee, as well as several University of Wisconsin professors. Actively participating in the Committee were supporters of the Progressive Labor Party, the Spartacist League/Revolutionary Communist Youth and trade unionists from the Teaching Assistants Association of the AFT and AFSCME Local 634.

At the rally an SL/RCY spokesman criticized the sectarianism of the Young Socialist Alliance, namely its refusal to participate in the united-front committee, even though it attended the rally and its spokesmen claimed it supported the demands, endorsed the demonstration and would help build it. Even this position represented a shamefaced retreat for the YSA, which had earlier walked out of the planning meeting called by the SL/RCY, tailing behind an SWP supporter who had left on the grounds that he could not endorse the demonstration unless Luis Vitale's name appeared alongside that of Van Schouwen and Romero. ■

Continued from page 3

Chile After the Coup

MIR itself used to say, led straight to the victory of the military putsch last September.

As early as 1970 the Spartacist League pointed out that the MIR's policy of "critical support" to the Unidad Popular was in fact an excuse for acting as the left tail of the Allende government. Earlier articles on Chile in *Workers Vanguard* noted that these left Castroites never understood the basic question posed by the UP regime, namely its *class character* as a popular-front bourgeois government. They instead labeled it "reformist" and concentrated on criticizing some of its policies and the "orientation" of "certain sectors" of the coalition, i.e., the CP. We warned that without a policy of intransigent opposition to the popular front, calling on the workers parties to break with the bourgeoisie and take power in their own name, the MIR could provide no way forward for the Chilean masses. The utter impotence of the MIR in the face of the coup and now its sharp turn to the right must serve to underline these warnings.

"Unity" and Capitulation

Today the struggle against Stalinist and social-democratic popular-front politics is more crucial than ever as every fake left from MAPU and the MIR to the CP hastens to call for the "broadest possible anti-fascist unity" as a cover for capitulating to the class enemy.

The task of the hour is to begin the political preparation for a workers and peasants revolution, not some kind of "people's revolution" to restore bourgeois democracy! The MIR wants

a "political front of the anti-gorilla resistance incorporating all the forces of the left and a sector of the CDP"? Well then, comrades of the MIR, are you prepared to tell workers who are occupying factories in the aftermath of the overthrow of the military dictatorship that they must "wait," just as the Stalinists always preached? That is what unity with the bourgeoisie means, and nothing else. This was the line of Scheidemann and Noske in Germany in 1918. Enforcing this policy, the soldiers of the social-democratic government shot the leading Communists, Luxemburg and Liebknecht.

The MIR leaders seek to defend their right turn with the assertion that the Stalinists and bourgeois parties of the UP have now committed themselves to "armed struggle." This is an old Castroist/Maoist ruse, since adopted by the pseudo-Trotskyist guerrilla enthusiasts of the Mandel wing of the so-called "United Secretariat." The Stalinists have never rejected armed struggle, when they are forced to undertake it by the logic of self-preservation; neither have bourgeois populists like Perón. Perón and the left Peronists favored armed struggle against the Argentine military dictatorship—should communists have sought a "unified anti-gorilla resistance front" with them, as the PRT/ERP "Trotskyist guerrillas" did? Only if they want to sign their own death warrants! The Stalinists led the armed struggle against the fascists in Italy and France during World War II—only to betray the struggle at the decisive moment by dissolving the resistance units with arrival of Allied forces and ordering their guns to be turned in. In addition, they shot every Trotskyist they could get their hands on.

It is possible to betray a revolution "gun in hand." In fact, the MIR's profuse commitments to "armed struggle" have not prevented it from capitulating to the same enemies and the same reformist, class-collaborationist

policies it vehemently denounced only nine months ago. The real unity of the working class is programmatic—unity to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat, unity to build the revolutionary Trotskyist party. What has happened in Chile in the past year has been a bloody defeat for the working class. The task now is not to achieve unity with the traitors who systematically prepared this massacre with their criminal policies, but division and split!

Without the destruction of the Stalinist and social-democratic stranglehold on the workers, without the splitting of the mass reformist workers parties, the seeds of a new catastrophe are already now being sown. An underground Bolshevik party must be built which will relentlessly drive home the lessons of the popular-front debacle and prepare the working class so this does not occur once again. Such a party would undertake to lead the strikes which must come, the underground trade unions, the soviets. It would make temporary blocs with the UP parties and even Christian Democratic unionists in order to undertake specific actions. But it would do so not to achieve some kind of bogus strategic unity with the conscious agents of the bourgeoisie but so that it could better destroy their stranglehold on the workers movement and drive home the reality of their sabotage of proletarian struggle in the name of "people's unity."

The time is ripe in Chile today for a far-reaching revolutionary political regroupment. Not only the Stalinists and social democrats, but the centrist MIR are faced with severe political disorientation as a result of the coup. The first condition for success in this enterprise is granite determination to defend the Trotskyist program of permanent revolution. Not capitulation to the popular-front traitors, but relentless exposure of their crimes and inoculation of the working class against reformism! ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Bi-weekly of the Spartacist League

Editorial Board:

Liz Gordon (chairman)
Jan Norden (managing editor)
Chris Knox (labor editor)
Karen Allen (production manager)
Joseph Seymour

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

West Coast Editor: Mark Small
Southern Editor: Joe Vetter
Midwest Editor: Steve Green

Published by the Spartacist Publishing Company, Box 1377, G. P. O., New York, N. Y. 10001. Telephone: 925-8234.

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

USec World Congress Preserves "Scotch-Tape" Unity

The Tenth World Congress of the so-called "United Secretariat," which not only falsely claims to be Trotskyist but fancies itself to be the Fourth International as well, was held in southern Sweden in the middle of February. Ostensibly devoted to political discussion of outstanding differences, the repeatedly postponed congress was in fact a desperate attempt on the part of the two main currents in the USec—the reformist minority led by the fraternal U.S. affiliate, the Socialist Workers Party, and the centrist majority led by the ex-Ligue Communiste of France and other European sections—to paper over deep programmatic divergences in order to be able to proclaim the health, growth and democratic functioning of their pseudo-"Fourth International."

Actually, the USec congress merely consolidated the political divisions between the main protagonists by a series of last-minute organizational deals and political maneuvers. Where the internal tensions in the national sections of this far from "united" rotten bloc have already led to an open split, as has occurred already in five countries (Canada, Mexico, Australia, Peru and Spain), the congress attempted to put on a good face by elevating the dissident groups to the status of sympathizing organizations. The Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG) in Canada and the Communist League of Australia, both of which support the European majority, were accepted into the USec on this basis. In Argentina, as a result of the abrupt departure of the until-then majority-supported PRT/ERP (the so-called "Trotskyist guerrillas") from USec ranks last summer, the congress recognized the minority-ite Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST) as the sole sympathizing section (with which the pro-majority former "Red Faction" of the PRT/ERP had recently fused).

Parallel to the organizational horse-trading were the political deals aimed at pacifying everyone, but which of course satisfied nobody. Prior to the congress the main debates had centered on the guerrilla orientation of the European majority, particularly as expressed in the 1969 USec Latin American resolution but also, as the recent SWP/ex-Ligue Communiste dispute over the Basque nationalists' assassination of Spanish premier Carrero Blanco demonstrated, with regard to Europe and the U.S. as well.

Since the brunt of the SWP-led minority's criticisms had been directed against the Argentine PRT/ERP—which claimed Mao, Castro, Ho Chi Minh and Kim Il Sung among its mentors and which walked out of the USec last summer—the Mandel/Maitan/Frank-led majority attempted to cover its tracks by belatedly discovering "militarist deviations" in the ERP. As a result of the majority's embarrassment over the departure of the PRT/ERP, Livio Maitan, the chief proponent of USec guerrilla strategy for Latin America, was forced to make a mild self-criticism (*Intercontinental Press*, 2 July 1973), and the SWP-backed PST was reconfirmed as a sympathizing section. On the other hand, the utter political bankruptcy of the PST was clearly demonstrated by the assertion by some of its delegates at the congress that the situation in Argentina would "stabilize" in the near future—a prediction made at the height of Perón's witchhunt against the left and shortly before the right-wing police coup in Córdoba!

In fact, however, the majority sees a guerrilla orientation as valid in Europe also. Thus the ex-Ligue Communiste (and its Spanish satellite, the LCR) has consistently advocated "minority vanguard violence" as an important means for mobilizing the masses. Only last year a member of the Political Bureau of the Ligue referred to the Uruguayan Tupamaros as making appropriate use of the "military abilities" of the petty bourgeoisie to compensate for the passivity of the working class (*[SWP] Internal Information Bulletin*, No. 6 in 1973). That this line has had considerable influence in the European majority, despite a formal retraction by its author, was shown by the Ligue's substitutionist attempt to single-handedly take on the armed might of the French state with its attack on a meeting of the fascist Ordre Nouveau last June. It was this adventure which led to the banning of the Ligue, now regrouped as supporters of the *Rouge* newspaper.

The terrorism/guerrillaism debate flared anew in January over the assassination of the Spanish premier by the Basque nationalist ETA-V only a few weeks before the world congress. The pro-European majority Spanish groups, the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria and ETA-VI (a split-off from ETA-V) gave "total support" to the dramatic bomb attack (see interview published in *Intercontinental Press*, 21 January 1974) on the grounds that it opened up a political crisis in Spain. This, of course, leads to the question, if the European majority "totally supports" such terrorist actions, why does it not undertake them itself? The question is left unanswered for the moment, because USec leaders are well aware of Lenin's and Trotsky's consistent opposition to the anarchist-nationalist strategy of terrorism, as well as being unwilling to risk giving up their respectability which enables them to run candidates for office (perhaps even getting free television time!), hold mass meetings on Chile, etc.

The Mandel/Maitan/Frank majority also attempted to minimize the profound political differences by making concessions to the so-called "Third Tendency," led by the Kompass current in the German section, the Gruppe Internationaler Marxisten (GIM). The majority adopted cosmetic amendments proposed by the Kompass tendency which simply replaced some of the more obviously anti-Marxist language of the

European "new mass vanguard" document, without changing its essential content. Even these alterations, however, did not pacify the Kompass group which drew up its own resolution (as well as sending a delegate to the SWP convention in December). A leading figure in the Kompass has reportedly said that the factional battle is continuing in Germany, where it was separated from the majority by only two votes out of 238 at the last national conference of the GIM.

The truly desperate character of the deals at the world congress is indicated by rumors that chief majority spokesman Ernest Mandel had to threaten to vote with the SWP before some of the European delegations would vote for the organizational compromises. Equally interesting evidence is the report that the U.S. fraternal group has, in effect, decided to boycott the resident secretariat by refusing to send its own representative to assist the body which carries out the decisions of the congress under the direction of the International Executive Committee.

While the European majority was able, with some difficulty, to present a united front against the SWP, it is far from united itself. In addition to tensions between Mandel and Maitan, there is considerable unease over the Latin American guerrilla orientation. Prior to the congress, the editor of *Rouge*, J.-P. Beauvais, who is also the leading USec spokesman on Chile, had contributed a devastating critique of the majority position on Latin America, while also rejecting the minority. Meanwhile, the ex-Ligue is stagnating, with little real internal discussion and a widespread sense of isolation, ineffectiveness and disgruntlement. One recent example of the total political disorientation of the ex-Ligue is the fact that during the recent French bank strike, *Rouge* supporters put out a leaflet concentrating on four demands, one of which was: "for clear demands!"

In the official voting the Mandelites

received 65 percent of the delegate votes; however, when the votes of sympathizing organizations are counted in, their majority falls to a bare 53 percent. In addition to the existence of roughly equal forces on the international level, the political differences between the two wings of the "United Secretariat" have by no means diminished. Thus the organizational maneuvering of the last several months is at best a stop-gap measure which will be unable to prevent new oppositions and splits. (The reported ban on new expulsions will be no more effective in preventing splits than Mandel's earlier "unity" preachings were in stopping the walk-outs by pro-majority groups in Canada and Australia.)

Amid the mire and ooze of the USec swamp, the task of serious militants seeking their way to Trotskyism is to struggle for political clarity. This is something which neither side in the dispute desires, for it would burst apart their fake "International"—in the process forcing hundreds of activists to study Lenin and Trotsky rather than figuring out better ways of adapting to their respective "mass movements" and "new mass vanguards." It is necessary to understand that the SWP and Mandel/Maitan/Frank are united in one respect, namely their common hostility to authentic Trotskyism.

Both minority and majority reflect the same adaptation to non-proletarian leaderships which is at the heart of the Pabloist revisionism which destroyed the Fourth International at the time of the 1953 split. If the SWP supporters stand to the right of their European counterparts, it is primarily a reflection of differences in the milieu to which they are capitulating—radical petty-bourgeois guerrillaism in the latter case and bourgeois pacifism, feminism, black nationalism and labor reformism in the former. The struggle for the rebirth of the Fourth International is above all a struggle for the program of revolutionary Marxism. ■

SWP's Militant Tells Stalinists:

Axe Trotskyists "Politically"!

On March 10 supporters of the Spartacist League were excluded from a Conference for Fair Immigration Laws and Practices held in East Los Angeles. This expulsion was engineered by the Communist Party-supported CASA in a desperate move to cut off political debate on the role of Stalinism in preparing the bloody defeat of the Chilean workers and peasants. This discussion had been initiated by the sharp political intervention of the SL at the conference.

Seeking, in the words of CASA treasurer Soledad Alatorre, to "get rid of these Trotskyite disrupters who are trying to destroy the unity of our movement," the Stalinist leadership of the conference moved to exclude the SL on the pretext of the SL's "insults" to "socialist Poland"! The SL had criticized the recent scabbing by the Polish bureaucrats who shipped coal to Britain during the recent miners' strike.

What was the ostensibly Trotskyist SWP's response to this filthy Stalinist exclusion? They sat on their hands and uttered not one murmur of protest. This crime has now been compounded by a disgraceful article entitled "Critics from the Sidelines" by one Miguel Pendás (*Militant*, 5 April 1974) criticizing the role of the SL at the conference.

The bulk of Pendás' article is a masterpiece of slander and innuendo, providing the Stalinists with arguments that the conference organizers were not astute enough to make themselves. Although noting the SL's opposition to "community control," the article ignored the SL's call for a class-struggle perspective which includes a fight for full citizenship rights for all foreign workers in the U.S., a concerted drive by the unions to organize the unorganized, a shorter workweek with no loss in pay to eliminate unemployment and the construction of a workers party to fight for a workers

government. Instead of dealing with the SL's positions politically, Pendás relies on not-so-veiled accusations of racism, i.e., "The Spartacists tell us not to do anything that might offend white people." (For an accurate account of the conference and the CASA-engineered exclusion, see the last issue of *Workers Vanguard*.)

But the low point of Pendás' article is his attempt to dissociate the SWP from the SL's exclusion. Nowhere stating the real reason for the exclusion, he lectures the Stalinists that the exclusion was a tactical mistake. Offering the CASA Stalinists some friendly advice on how to axe the Trotskyists, he sermonizes that "the most effective way to deal with them [the SL] is to politically expose their false ideas." Members of the SWP, do you know what you are saying?

The SL was excluded because the Stalinists wanted to stifle discussion of their traitorous policies in Chile; the excuse was our exposure of the Polish bureaucrats' scabbing on the British miners' strike! There is a better way, remarks Pendás coyly—"defeat their ideas." You see, says the SWP in effect, "comrade Stalin" was too crude in his ways; instead of murdering thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists and Trotsky himself he should have concentrated on "defeating their ideas." Members of the SWP, your grovelling cowardice has led you to defend the Stalinist policy of "socialism in one country"! You are apologizing for the exclusion of militants who were defending principled Marxist positions that you yourselves pretend to hold. Or do you? Has the SWP's tailing alter-"consistent nationalism" reached the point that the distinction between Trotskyism and Stalinism, between principled revolutionary Marxism and whoring for the capitalists, has no meaning at all to you? Apparently so!

SUBSCRIBE:

Australasian Spartacist

A monthly organ of revolutionary Marxism for the rebirth of the Fourth International published by the Central Committee of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand

12 issues

OVERSEAS:
\$2 by surface mail
\$5 by air mail

order from/pay to:

SPARTACIST LEAGUE of
AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND
GPO Box 3473
Sydney, NSW, Australia

What Workers' Control Is Not Lessons of the LIP Str

PARIS—The drawn-out struggle of the workers at the Lip watch factory at Besançon began with the takeover of the plant by the strikers in June 1973 and ended nine months later with the imposition of an agreement which represents a clear defeat for the workers. The action captured the attention of the workers of France who were and still are threatened by the tightening cycle of permanent unemployment, rising inflation and threatened plant closures.

The announcement last June 12 by the Lip administration of the separation of the factory into three different sections (watches, precision machinery, weapons) and the termination of salaries provoked the takeover of the plant three days later by the 1,300 Lip workers.

The reformist trade-union bureaucrats found themselves helpless as the rising tide of anger and determination of the workers expressed itself in acts which went far beyond the norms of bourgeois law and by implication challenged the cornerstone of capitalism, private property. The strikers not only stayed in the factory but decided to start the production and selling of watches, keeping the money in order to pay themselves. (Traditionally the trade unions in France have no strike funds.)

Also they took as "hostage" a stock of 25,000 watches, their "trésor de guerre" or war chest, and publicly exposed the company books, revealing documents with the details of the company's carefully worked-out plan of systematic layoffs. These audacious acts stirred great publicity both in the left and bourgeois press. They also put the union brass on the spot and posed the need for a revolutionary leadership to take the struggle forward to victory.

Who Shall Run the Factories?

The main organizational form of the strike, issuing out of the traditions of May-June 1968, was the general assembly of all the workers, the only body with decision-making power. The general assembly broke itself down into a number of committees to deal with different aspects of the strike: for production, publicity, correspondence, defense and a special "action committee" which played an important role especially at the beginning of the strike.

Although it played an important role in leading the strike, this committee was not a factory committee as referred to in Trotsky's "Transitional Program" or early resolutions of the Communist International. It did group together a part of the union members (in this case the ex-Christian Democratic CFDT and the Communist Party-controlled CGT) were the two main unions in the factory) along with the most militant non-union workers. However, it was not elected but entirely voluntary and could therefore not be held responsible for its actions, with the possibility of recall. At its height, the committee numbered one hundred members and essentially initiated the early part of the strike, but was soon overtaken by the trade-union apparatus.

Initially bypassed by the militant action of the workers, the CGT and CFDT found themselves having to support the workers or be outdistanced and left completely isolated. They formed a tenuous bloc with one another for leadership in the strike, which was made difficult for them given the democratic organizational forms initiated and maintained by the workers during the conflict. It is to the credit of the militant workers of Lip that it took nine months of struggle before the bureaucracy was able to channel their fight into "acceptable" norms.

The question posed by the continued

occupation of the factory—that of who owns and runs it, the workers or the boss—was not lost on either the bourgeoisie or the working-class movement. Each in its own way had to respond to this question.

To a section of the ruling class, Lip provided an opening to warm over the old Gaullist concept of "participation," in which a couple of workers or union representatives formally sit on the board of directors but lack any real power. This provoked only mildest sympathy from some die-hard Gaullists and laughter from everyone else. However in the workers movement the questions of workers control, workers management and "autogestion" (self-management) stirred widespread debate as a result of the Lip strike.

Workers control and workers management are closely related, but they must be precisely defined. "Workers control is the attempt to impose control over different aspects of the power of the bosses and the ruling class" (*Workers' Control*, Revolutionary Communist Bulletin No. 6 of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand). This includes the different aspects of control of hiring, the opening of company books for public inspection, control over line-speed rates, overtime and other aspects of the work organization.

Because it directly attacks the prop-

more staid CGT counterparts.

Workers management of expropriated industry is in the Marxist sense a beginning of the reorganization of production for social needs. Self-management or "autogestion" in contrast is used as a reformist fig-leaf which does not pose the question of state power. Numerous such schemes have been propounded by the employers in Germany and France.

The growing number of factory takeovers and other forms associated with "workers control" and *autogestion*, and the so-far successful reformist channeling of this fight by the union bureaucracy, only emphasize the necessity for clarity on how and in what conditions workers control can advance the struggle and at the same time expose the sell-out bureaucratic trade-union leadership.

Crisis of Leadership

The dominant CFDT's role in the strike was exemplified by its utterly reformist "consciousness-raising" approach to workers control. For it, the question of a change in the economic system or for that matter in who runs the factory is not dependent on the taking of state power, but instead is a question of workers' developing the confidence and expertise to collectively run things by themselves. All during the

tion and not as an experiment in self-management. The decision to produce and sell watches for their own salaries was understood as a tactic used to keep them alive for the duration of a long, hard fight. They harbored no illusions of taking over the factory in order to make it profitable; which is best illustrated by the fact that during the early part of the strike just one assembly line was started up again with only about one hundred workers out of 1,300 producing.

The Lip workers were very conscious of going beyond the normal trade-union forms of struggle. The text of the banner installed before the plant read "It is possible, we make, we sell, we pay ourselves!" But this slogan also illustrates the limitation of the struggle, despite its use of the "illegal" militant tactic of factory occupation, to economic reforms.

This limitation was demonstrated by the Lip workers' three demands: (1) no layoffs, (2) no subdivision and (3) no loss of benefits previously won. Reinforced by the reformist bureaucratic CFDT/CGT misleadership, these economic demands were never raised to the level of political struggle. This fact serves as an indictment less of the bureaucrats, from whom one must expect a narrowly reformist approach, than of the ostensibly revolutionary movement which failed to intervene with a revolutionary program.



Pay distribution at Lip during factory occupation.

erty rights of the owners, the slogan of workers control immediately raises the question of state power and therefore must be closely linked to the political perspective of a workers government to expropriate the exploiting class. In contrast, the slogan of workers control if confined within the limits of bourgeois society becomes only one more phony reform peddled to the working class and used to keep the struggle within the bounds of capitalism. The presentation of demands for workers control, linking them either to a reformist or revolutionary perspective, is doubly important in France where the CFDT labor federation, under the leadership of Edmond Maire, has achieved a militant reputation from its calls for "self-management"—despite the fact that it supports the popular-front Union of the Left electoral coalition and is in fact no more interested in revolution than its

strike the CFDT limited itself to finding a "better" boss to take the factory!

As for the fake-Trotskyist ex-Ligue Communiste, its oft-repeated attack on *autogestion* ("there is no island of self-management possible in a capitalist world") served it as an orthodox cover for its opportunist practice. It was only too happy to continually point to the exemplary nature of the Lip struggle and to reinforce its isolation by simply glorifying its combativity. The ex-Ligue consistently uncritically tailed after the leader of the strikers, Charles Piaget, head of the CFDT and Lip and also a member of the PSU (a petty-bourgeois left-social-democratic party), in yet another example of its systematic capitulation to the present bureaucratic misleaders of the workers movement.

The strikers themselves correctly viewed their action as a defensive ac-

As an example, for Lutte Ouvrière (LO) "it was the job of the revolutionaries to do all in their power to draw a clear picture of the political lessons and the perspectives offered by the then-growing movement in Besançon" (*Class Struggle/Lutte de classe*, November 1973). This passive reaction to the Lip strike was also reflected by routine reportage of the day-to-day happenings at Besançon. They presented themselves as spectators waiting for the "lessons" of the strike to be brought to the working class.

Although the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) attacked the illusions spread by the reformist approach to *autogestion*, it failed to adequately warn the workers of the treachery of their leadership. A prime example, occurring early in July, was a series of unanswered questions (the OCI's favorite form of expression) over

rike

how to give aid and support to the isolated Lip workers who had just been told that the banks would give no credit to them:

"We ask the question again: why don't the trade unions of bank employees, and those of the BNP in particular, take it upon themselves to unblock the credits necessary in order to assure the pay and permit the factory to work? Would this not be the best way to demonstrate the solidarity that everybody is speaking about?"

—*Informations Ouvrières*, 4 July 1973

The OCI's pretended inability to answer the question is one of the consequences of the anti-Leninist concept of a "strategic united front," a pervasive deviation which in practice is translated into systematic capitulation to the bureaucratic misleaders of the working class.

French State Sends in Riot Cops

By mid-August, realizing that with the end of summer vacation came the return of millions of workers to their factories and recognizing the danger posed by the widespread popularity of and support for Lip, the government carefully prepared the preliminary steps for dealing with the continued occupation by the strikers. On 15 August in the early morning the CRS—the brutal riot police created in 1948 by "socialist" minister Jules Moch—occupied the factory after easily expelling the twenty-five Lip workers on guard. The response of the working class was immediate, with sympathy strikes, spontaneous demonstrations and solidarity strikes occurring throughout France.

The tide of immediate outpouring of support for the Lip workers, a phenomenon unheard-of in the middle of the summer vacation period, caused little trouble to the well-oiled machinery of the Communist Party, together with the CFDT. They were only too happy to dissipate emotions into mass demonstrations such as held at the Paris stock exchange two days after the police occupation.

The dramatic demonstration of solidarity, even though effectively channeled, culminated in a grand finale during the summer's-end "rentrée." The famous march on Besançon, proposed and effectively controlled by the trade unions, was born. The well-attended march was enthusiastically tailed by the ex-Ligue's *Rouge*, LO and Révolution! (a split-off from the Ligue) who sent sizeable delegations on the march. For the ex-Ligue, "the task of revolutionaries is to make [the march] a success" (*Rouge*, 14 September 1973). The CP sent only its sizeable "service d'ordre" (defense squad) to Besançon—which proved useful in containing the forces of *Rouge*, LO and Révolution! (who were forced to band together for protection from the CP's goons).

Meanwhile, the OCI counterposed a call for a national march on Paris, explaining that the demonstration in Besançon only led (geographically) away from the direction of bourgeois power which was concentrated in Paris. However, when it was apparent even to the OCI that the march was going to take place with or without them, it silently let the matter drop and did not intervene at all in the march.

Left Fails to Recognize Setback

The loss of the factory was a real blow to the Lip workers. They lost their first line of defense and from this moment on they remained vulnerable before the avenging capitalists and union misleaders. This major defeat could



CRS riot police patrol Lip factory.

have been avoided had there been a real revolutionary leadership at Lip to organize mass occupation of the plant.

Piaget poured soothing ointment over the workers' anger and determination by stating "They [the state] do not know that the factory is where the workers are. The factory is not the walls, it is the men" (*Le Monde*, 16 August 1973). This statement may have something to do with the guild crafts of the medieval age when workers carried their tools with them, but it is certainly irrelevant to the reality of modern capitalism, which is defined precisely by the separation of the worker from the means of realization of his labor power.

In a similar vein, the ex-Ligue Communiste, while denouncing the CRS occupation, had in July already pronounced its verdict on this expected eventuality that "the strikers outside the factory are just as dangerous to the [state] power as those on the inside. They would not be isolated, on the contrary that could only intensify the popularization campaign" (*Rouge*, 27 July 1973). The isolation of Lip was on the contrary made only more total by the expulsion. Even if *Rouge* was not aware of it, this act was only the beginning of the end.

Lutte Ouvrière, reacting in an editorial to the police occupation, asserted that "... the government operation will have succeeded on one point: it will have demonstrated to the workers of Lip ... that the government was not neutral in this affair. ... By defending Lip, we make a gesture of solidarity toward our own selves" (*Lutte Ouvrière*, 21 August 1973).

Apparently these comrades were content to comment about the relationship of the state to the interests of the bourgeoisie only after its concrete expression. While the level of class consciousness at Lip was certainly not homogeneous, the advanced sections of workers no doubt had already figured out that much and had no use for the primer-book approach of LO.



Sign says: "It is possible, we make, we sell, we pay ourselves!"

The reaction of the OCI, demanding that the trade unions call for a general strike in order to broaden the conflict instead of limiting it to its local particularities, revealed a correct impulse. However, the OCI's repetitive calls for the trade unions to realize unity have no meaning without an exposure of the real barrier to unity: the labor bureaucrats' failure to mobilize the workers around a class-struggle program.

The strikers through all of this continued their fight, showing great imagination and combativity. They set up a new factory in an old gymnasium and continued to sell and produce watches there. The finishing touch was taking with them small but vital parts from their machines at the police-occupied Lip factory so that while the machinery was not destroyed the production was hampered.

Union Bureaucrats Negotiate a Sellout

After the turmoil of all the marches and demonstrations was over, everybody went home leaving the Lip workers to deal with the slow grind of the negotiations to find a new owner for the factory. The involvement of the workers in the negotiations was very high. Tape recordings of the proceedings were played at the daily general assemblies, which gave them a check on their leadership, preventing any secret deals.

The fruit of these lengthy and convoluted negotiations was the Giraud plan which emerged in the middle of October. According to the plan, 989 of the 1,300 workers would be rehired but with very little guarantees and the firm would be split into three sections under separate ownership, blatantly going against the workers' original three non-negotiable demands.

The reaction of the workers was overwhelmingly against the plan which did not meet their conditions and completely ignored job security. The CFDT rode the crest of this sentiment and opposed the settlement while the CGT fraction in the general assembly cautiously gave it its support. The CGT was obviously anxious for the affair to be settled quickly and to be out of sight and mind of the rising tide of class struggle.

In a secret ballot the strikers voted down the Giraud plan by 626 against and 174 in favor. The outcome represented a real defeat for the CGT as the number voting in favor of the agreement represented a substantial loss in their rank-and-file support in the general assembly.

After the rejection of this settlement, there followed a period of slump. The isolation of Lip, brought on and encouraged by the CFDT-CGT leadership, was by now almost complete. The confidence of the workers in their leadership was even pondered over in the bourgeois press:

"No criticism is made of these same trade unionists, who a little while ago

were interrupting the negotiations in order to report to the base, but who today speak of secret contracts. Indifference or blind confidence? The strikers seem to have contracted a solid pact with the organization which since April has been stating that Lip can again take up its activity in its totality."

—*Le Monde*, 23 November 1973

Despite their discouragement the strikers fought on for their demands. Attendance at the general assemblies, which numbered from seven to nine hundred at the beginning, now brought only four hundred daily. But as one striker commented, "It is true, they are nearly all registered at the employment agency, but they refuse all job offers. Even the cadres [highly-skilled workers] have rejected certain offers. They still believe that Lip will live" (*ibid.*).

In the meanwhile, the CFDT-CGT leadership continued its search for a "good boss" for the Lip workers. New negotiations were held with a certain Claude Neuschwander representing French and Swiss interests, against a background of diminishing national interest now distracted by the Chilean coup, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the fuel crisis.

The Neuschwander plan, unveiled by the end of January, revealed the full scope of the coming defeat. The agreement calls for the rehiring of three hundred workers with the possibility of five hundred others being called back on the condition that the factory is profitable. The remainder of the Lip workers was given vague promises of retraining and rehiring in surrounding factories.

The sliding scale of wages (a cost-of-living clause) was not mentioned at all. Yet it had been one of the most important gains achieved by the Lip workers in the recent period, one which was unique to them in that region of France and represented for them a long and difficult fight. The three sections of the factory, while not under separate ownership, are in the hands of a holding company indicating that its eventual dissolution is by no means excluded.

Backed up against a wall, the Lip workers with the advice of the CFDT and CGT accepted the plan. One of the conditions turned out to be the return to the "proper authority" of the famous war chest (the stock of watches). The ink was hardly dry on the settlement when the CFDT leadership returned the watches, valued at fifteen million francs (\$3 million), the company documents taken from the owners, the machine pieces and 2,194,363 francs representing the difference between the receipts from the watches produced and sold and the "illegal" pay of the strikers!

Fake Lefts Hail Lip "Victory"

With this crushing defeat and betrayal of the strike, the CFDT had the gall to label it a great victory. Piaget in summarizing the conflict states,

continued on page 10

Against Oppression of Women Workers— A CLASS- STRUGGLE PROGRAM

In contrast to the vague reformist "Statement of Purpose" railroaded through the CLUW conference by its bureaucrat organizers, a Marxist program is based on the understanding that it is necessary to go beyond the confines of capitalism to eliminate the oppression of women workers. The program printed below starts with the immediate needs of the doubly oppressed woman worker and through a series of transitional demands leads the struggle forward to the inexorable conclusion: socialist revolution.

1. For trade-union organization! Organize the unorganized!

In addition to aggressive organizing campaigns, a real effort to incorporate the masses of unorganized women into the labor movement will require such militant tactics as secondary boycotts and "hot cargoing" (refusing to handle) scab goods in support of such campaigns. For example, a pan-union organization like CLUW could call upon its Teamster members to wage a fight within their union to halt Fitzsimmons' campaign to destroy the Farm Workers and instead assist UFW organizing through Teamster hot-cargoing of scab lettuce and grapes.

2. No job discrimination based on race, sex or age! Equal pay for equal work! Equal access to all job categories! A shorter workweek with no loss in pay! Union control of hiring and upgrading on a first-come, first-served basis! Extend protective legislation to men! Strike against layoffs!

Such demands can improve the position of women in the workforce and strike a blow against unemployment through united struggle of the working class rather than inflaming sexual and racial antagonisms by pitting one section of the workers against another. Affirmative action programs, such as advocated by CLUW leaders and initiated by the government, give preference to women and minorities in hiring, transfers and promotions, thus constituting a form of reverse discrimination. They also weaken the unions by bypassing hard-won seniority systems and union hiring halls. Make the bosses pay to eliminate discrimination by providing jobs for all!

3. Socialize household labor! Free quality health care for all, including free abortion and birth control on demand! Free 24-hour child care paid for by the state or employer and under worker-parent control! Free, immediate divorce on demand!

The struggle for the emancipation of women in the workplace cannot be separated from the struggle for the emancipation of women from the family. The family is the principal institution for the oppression of women under capitalism, rendering housewives economically and psychologically dependent on their husbands, isolated from the class struggle and held back in their political development. It also serves to atomize the working class into isolated cells, each one consumed by its own private problems. Women must be free to engage in socially productive labor; quality social services are the alternative to enforced domestic drudgery.

4. Build militant caucuses based on a class-struggle program! For a workers party! Toward a workers government!

The Democratic and Republican parties are run by and for the capitalists. They will never fight in the interests of workers because they are based upon the exploitative system. The union bureaucrats who are running CLUW call for putting faith in Republican or Democratic "friends of labor" who regularly vote for wage controls, to break strikes, against an adequate minimum wage, etc. Workers, men or women, must break with these parties of the bosses and form a workers party based on the trade unions to struggle for a workers government and expropriate the capitalist class.



CLUW leaders' "historic moment." Edith van Horn, second from left. Second from right, Addie Wyatt; far right, Chairman Olga Madar.

Does Nothing for Women's Rights

CLUW Conference: Bureaucracy and Tokenism

The Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW) held its founding conference in Chicago over the weekend of March 23-24. Fifty-eight national and international unions were represented. The conference was attended by 3,200 women, and it appeared that virtually every woman active during the past ten years in left-wing or trade-union politics was present.

The large attendance was partially a reflection of the drying up of the petty-bourgeois women's liberation movement, which left many militant women with no organizational vehicle for their radical activism. It also reflects the real and felt double oppression of women workers, whose needs and interests are systematically ignored by the narrowly self-interested and socially deeply conservative trade-union bureaucracies.

The forces which led to the setting up of CLUW, however, are quite different. Recognizing these working women as a potential constituency, the female union bureaucrats who initiated CLUW are seeking to build a militant-sounding but powerless organization to use as leverage to increase their clout within the existing structure. At the same time, as was made clear at the Chicago conference by the impressive display of top union brass and the heated battle over whether or not to take a position on the Teamsters' scabbing on the Farm Workers, the International bureaucracies themselves are closely controlling the whole operation to make sure it does not get out of hand.

Rigid bureaucratic control by the conference organizers was necessary to keep in check the impulses of militancy, trade-union solidarity and internationalism manifested by many rank-and-file participants. A purposefully vague "Statement of Purpose" and the election of national officers were rammed through despite eruptions of stormy and bitter debate over such issues as union democracy and solidarity with the UFW.

Despite the gross bureaucratism of the proceedings and the CLUW leadership's single-minded avoidance of "controversial" class-struggle politics, the principled programmatic approach of the Spartacist League emerged as the clear working-class pole and was recognized by the CLUW organizers as the main danger to their stage-managed reformist conference.

Trade-union supporters of the Spartacist League had attended several regional CLUW gatherings during the past few months to counterpose a class-struggle program to the narrow reformism of CLUW, in addition to exposing the CLUW organizers' collaboration with agencies of the capitalist government and private union-busters like the Ford Foundation. These interventions were not without effect on the CLUW leadership, which came to this first national gathering prepared to do battle with the SL.

Addressing the United Auto Workers' (UAW) delegation caucus meeting Friday night, Olga Madar (UAW International Vice President, elected National Chairwoman of CLUW at this conference) waved a xeroxed copy of a *Workers Vanguard* article ("Women Bureaucrats Rig CLUW Conference," *WV* No. 40, 15 March) and told the delegates that if they heard anyone saying anything similar they should "shut them up." Due in part to this unsolicited advertising, Spartacist salesmen sold over 400 copies of *WV* and *Women and Revolution* to participants during the course of the conference.

(It has since been reported that this same Olga Madar was one of the leaders of the 1,000-strong goon squad of UAW officials mobilized to put down the Mack Avenue sitdown strike in Detroit last August [*Detroit Free Press*, 31 March]. It is unfortunate that this was not known at the conference, for then the question could have been sharply posed as to just who supports the cause of doubly oppressed women workers, bureaucratic

goons like Madar or rank-and-file militants like the supporters of the SL who fight for a class-struggle program.)

Split on "Union Democracy"

The conference excluded all women without union cards—a ploy to keep out radicals, but which also excluded the Brookside Women's Club and wives of the striking Harlan County miners who wanted to address the conference. There was even debate on whether members of public-employees unions (AFT, AFSCME) in states where they do not have the right to strike were a legitimate part of the conference! CLUW's advocacy of organizing the vast majority of unorganized women workers is thus revealed as a sheer fraud.

A railroading job was necessary to get the delegates to approve the agenda during the opening session Saturday morning. Addie Wyatt (Director of "Women's Affairs" for the Meat Cutters union, elected Vice-Chairman of CLUW) noted that everyone had a "private agenda," which she indicated should stay private so the conference could focus on "cooperation" by adopting her private agenda! Despite attempts to amend the agenda to allow for programmatic resolutions defining CLUW to be voted before the election of officers and to allow literature distribution and floor discussion, the agenda and conference rules were rammed through, although with significant opposition.

The discontent and political heterogeneity seething beneath the rigid structure were revealed when a seemingly innocuous amendment erupted into heated debate late Saturday night. The amendment simply noted that union members benefit from "full and complete democratic procedures" and called on CLUW to go on record as "encouraging democratic procedures in all unions." The motion split the conference down the middle. Three votes

had to be taken, including a final standing vote, and the motion only narrowly passed, with 700 for and 649 delegates voting *against* democracy in the unions! The tensions pushed underground by tight bureaucratic control surfaced as the amendment became a referendum on one's attitude toward the CLUW leadership. Those women, mostly bureaucrats themselves, who voted against the amendment did not want to imply in any way that the unions they were helping to run back home were undemocratic; besides, they had a suspicion that the motion was inspired by "radicals." Those who supported the amendment found in it a minimal way of expressing their distrust of the undemocratic conference proceedings.

Union Solidarity vs. CLUW

Controversy over support to the United Farm Workers (UFW) threatened to explode the carefully laid plans of the organizers. The proposed "Statement of Purpose" included what became the infamous "Point 14," stating that CLUW "not be involved in issues or activities which a union involved identifies as related to a jurisdictional dispute."

There is no "jurisdictional dispute" in the fields of California—Fitzsimmons' Teamster bureaucracy is conducting a straightforward strike-breaking operation, and Point 14 amounted to backhanded endorsement of Fitzsimmons' attempt to provide the growers with hired goons and scabs to smash the UFW. This willingness of the CLUW organizers to sacrifice the farm workers' struggle to petty deals with the Teamster bureaucracy was obscene and despicable.

The issue of deleting Point 14 was hotly debated in some workshops, while others voted unanimously to delete it.

Only widespread sympathy for the UFW made it possible to brush aside workshop leaders' ludicrous miscounts on votes and attempts to adjourn, and to finally push the motion to delete Point 14 to the plenary floor, where it passed.

The determination of UAW tops to preserve the conference façade of "unity" made them the broker for Fitzsimmons. Edith van Horn, International Representative of the UAW, in the same workshop as some of the leading UFW organizers, offered a "compromise" amendment to Point 14, which read "with full support of workers to have the union of their choice." Hoping to obscure the issue and make it seem "unreasonable" to oppose Point 14, this amendment merely echoes the rhetoric Fitzsimmons uses to justify his treachery.

A spokesman for the Militant Action Caucus (MAC) of the CWA pointed out in the discussion that UFW head Chavez' use of the bourgeois courts to sue the Teamsters gives Fitzsimmons a perfect tool for undercutting rank-and-file Teamster support to the UFW. Moreover, Chavez' pacifism and refusal to appeal to other unions for concerted militant class action in support of the UFW play right into the hands of the AFL-CIO and UAW tops, who refuse to go beyond token financial assistance to the UFW grape/lettuce boycott, which without strike action must necessarily be ineffective.

The Militant Action Caucus has been active in UFW defense in California, collecting money from its CWA local and traveling to Delano to participate in Farm Workers' rallies, where MAC proposals for a united labor defense of the UFW were warmly received by the union's ranks. The MAC submitted the same proposals to the conference, calling on CLUW to support and extend the boycott by calling for a California-wide

general strike and calling on all unions to refuse to handle struck goods. Given the UFW's catastrophic drop in membership and loss of contracts in the last year, only such a policy will keep it from going down to utter defeat at the hands of the Teamster-grower alliance.

UFW Capitulates—Conference Explodes

After pushing all weekend to have CLUW come out in support of the boycott, the UFW leaders present abruptly caved in to the conference organizers' pressure for "unity" and on Sunday afternoon dramatically dropped their motion, flatly deserting their numerous and vocal sympathizers. Josephina Flores of the UFW insisted that "this is not a fight with the Teamster sisters," who had earlier threatened to walk out of the conference if the motion in support of the UFW was passed!

The Teamster and UFW women, as-

above all in keeping the struggles of workers within reformist bounds. Cheers greeted her insistence that the Democratic Party in the U.S. cannot represent the interests of the working class and that workers need their own political party based on a class-struggle program. The delegates responded with applause to her internationalist orientation and in appreciation of the evident discomfiture of the conference leadership.

The conference ended on a sour note, as Edith van Horn quickly moved the agenda to announcement of national officers. In particular, UAW bureaucrat Madar, who was elected National Chairwoman, was greeted by booing. Flippanantly announcing that she had another unpopular announcement, van Horn proposed that all resolutions from the workshops on policies for CLUW be tabled to the new national coordinating committee, in final contemptuous disregard for the delegates, who came to



WV PHOTO

Sergeants-at-arms attempted to prevent the distribution of MAC literature.

sisted by Edith van Horn and Olga Madar of the UAW, held a tearful reconciliation on stage. However, this revolting spectacle did not put an end to the issue. A supporter of "Union Wage," a West Coast women's labor pressure group, rose to insist on introducing the motion to support the UFW. The conference exploded at this point, with half the delegates loudly demanding that the motion come to a vote and the other half equally loudly denouncing it as "disruptive." Although Madar condescendingly reprimanded the UFW supporters, reminding them that the UFW wanted the conference to proceed in an orderly fashion, they refused to be silenced. Anarchy reigned, as motions to suspend the rules were ignored, voice votes ignored and/or miscounted, speakers cut off at the mike, microphones unplugged and at last the sergeant-at-arms was instructed by the chair to clear the floor. The turmoil eventually subsided, and the motion to support the UFW never did come to a vote.

After imposing a bitter and uneasy "peace" the conference organizers attempted a diversion: a "guest speaker," Adaire Hannah, Australian Labor Party member and an active trade unionist in the Federated Clerks. Next time they will screen their "diversions" more carefully. Hannah, a militant fighter for the working class internationally, solidarized with the Militant Action Caucus as a model of how to conduct working-class struggle. She pointed out that women in the union leadership were no guarantee that women workers' interests would be upheld, citing the case of the New Zealand Clerical Workers' Union, where the woman president told women workers that it was reasonable to wait five years for equal pay.

Hannah discussed the role of the Australian Labor Party in both aiding and hindering the struggle of workers, comparing it to the American trade-union bureaucracy, which is interested

the conference to fight for their views, only to have the political decision-making "tabled" back to the bureaucratic leadership.

"Left" Takes a Dive

Most of the ostensibly revolutionary organizations, whose supporters attended the conference in some numbers, simply abdicated the basic duty of socialists to expose the self-serving reformism of the CLUW leadership and to counterpose a class-struggle program. The supporters of the International Socialists attempted to pressure the CLUW leaders to support the UFW (offering no criticism of Chavez' sellout policies) while hailing the conference as an exciting and positive development. Supporters of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) simply buried themselves—they even capitulated on support to the UFW, in the interests of preserving "unity." SWP supporters have been involved with CLUW for over a year, since the earliest planning meetings, and have yet to raise a word of criticism. The 5 April *Militant* reprinted the empty CLUW "Statement of Purpose," mildly noting that "it would have been educational..." if a political program and concrete proposals for action had been discussed and adopted!

The cynical silence of these opportunists, who hope to be allowed to be "the best builders" of yet another reformist diversion from the class struggle, starkly highlighted the role of the Militant Action Caucus and Spartacist League in polarizing the conference. The shameful default of the fake lefts enabled SL and MAC supporters to exercise a weight out of all proportion to their numerical strength at the CLUW conference. Only the principled program of Trotskyism offers a way forward for militant women workers to become leaders of a united working class rather than pawns in the CLUW leadership's cynical careerist games. ■



WV PHOTO

UFW spokesman addresses CLUW conference.

Militant Action Caucus CLUW Conference Resolution:

For a United Labor Defense of the UFW!

WHEREAS: the attack on the UFW by the Teamster bureaucracy-grower-government alliance threatens farmworkers with a return to pre-union working conditions by loss of UFW contracts,

WHEREAS: such a defeat would be a serious setback for the labor movement as a whole,

WHEREAS: the trade-union movement must enlist the assistance of the entire labor movement not only in boycotts, but in building a militant, unified working-class defense,

We call for state-wide general strikes to defend the UFW in face of attack, and further we call on all unions to direct its member unions to refuse to handle struck goods, recognizing that this was a key tactic in building the CIO in the 1930's,

Further, we oppose taking the Teamsters to the bosses' court to settle this affair, but counterpose a strong united labor defense as a winning strategy.

...Fremont GM

hoc committee in the Local was "informationally" picketing the plant, and some picketers were distributing a leaflet opposing the Local contract, which was finally coming up for ratification months after Woodcock's sell-out on the national contract. Some of the leafleters included ex-Brotherhood supporters who had been misled into voting for the Brotherhood by the aforementioned Maoists, particularly the *Bay Area Worker*, a paper supported by the RU. This "effrontery" of ex-supporters defying his will (and implicitly criticizing the International!) was apparently too much for Mays, who according to reports came over after the press conference and denounced the leafleters in a physically menacing manner, telling them they couldn't pass out their leaflet.

Ironically, this incident recalled to the mind of many militants earlier incidents in which supporters of RU and the *Bay Area Worker* had menaced and

attacked salesmen from socialist groups, including *Workers Vanguard*, outside the plant. When the Local passed a resolution—"No member of this union shall attempt to prevent the sales or distribution outside the plant of the literature of the various labor-socialist groups, since this violates the basic traditions of this union of free and open discussion within the labor movement"—the attacks ceased (see *WV* No. 32, 9 November 1973). Mays's action was such a gross violation of the rights of members to propagate their views within the union that another official came over later to apologize for him to the leafleters.

At a special ratification meeting, Mays enumerated the "achievements" of the Local contract: more phone booths, water fountains and coat hooks for the workers. Traded off for so many water fountains and coat hooks was a three-year accumulation of grievances—some held over from the previous administration—on job overloading, safety, etc., and numerous cases of political firings, including some Brotherhood supporters! Grievances against too much work were dropped because the line speed is going to change any-

way, said Mays. (Perhaps this is why he wants the Company to change over to small cars!)

The left-wing supporters of the Brotherhood were divided among themselves on the Local contract, with some voting for and some against! The teetering alliance of this group with the Brotherhood may well fall apart during the election for convention delegates, as the bureaucrats move in to divide up the "pie" their own way. Meanwhile, the old Unity slate has crawled out of the woodwork once more in time for the election, with no more programmatic differentiation from the Brotherhood than last time, naturally. The *Bay Area Worker*-backed "Concerned Rank and Filers," however, have thus far not announced candidates.

Also failing to announce candidates is the Trade Union Alliance for a Labor Party (TUALP), represented by Tom Cagle. TUALP is supported nationally by the pseudo-Trotskyist Workers League, a frenzied opportunist sect which thinks the struggle for wages is necessarily "revolutionary." The strange lack of relationship between reports in the WL paper, the *Bulletin*, and reality is explained simply by the fact that the political method of the Workers League consists of lying. For instance, a recent *Bulletin* (2 April 1974) claims that TUALP calls for a national strike to defend Lordstown workers and quotes Cagle as calling for a national strike in connection with layoffs, yet Cagle *abstained* on the February resolution calling for a nationwide strike against layoffs and for a shorter workweek!

The authors of that resolution, Joan Putnam and Darlene Fujino have declared themselves candidates for convention delegate on the basis of that resolution and what it represents as a class-struggle strategy counterposed to the Woodcock bureaucracy. They were also the authors of the earlier resolution defending the right of socialist groups to sell outside the plant, and Putnam is the co-chairman of the Committee to Fight Layoffs. Their programmatic statement, "Program Proposal for the UAW Convention," calls for a union hiring hall to eliminate all forms of discrimination instead of various preferential schemes, for nationalization of the auto and oil industries under workers control, and the formation of a labor party to fight for a workers government. It is precisely on this basis that a nationwide opposition must be formed in the UAW to break the repressive hold of the Woodcock regime on the union. It is to be hoped that these candidates will extend and deepen their commitment to this program, so that a permanently organized struggle may be conducted in the Local, going beyond the present elections. ■

FORUM: LESSONS OF CHILE

Speaker: JAN NORDEN
Editor, *Workers Vanguard*

- BUFFALO/APRIL 12/8 p.m.
State University of New York
Norton Union, Room 233
- TORONTO/APRIL 13/8 p.m.
University of Toronto
Hart House, So. Sitting Rm.

Corrections

The article "Canada's New Democratic Party: Right-Wing Social Democracy" in *WV* No. 41, 29 March stated that the League for Socialist Action (LSA) had been recently reduced to the status of sympathizing section of the "United Secretariat." However, while the Revolutionary Marxist Group was recognized as a sympathizing organization of the USec, the LSA remains the official section. The same article refers to the Dowson group leaving the LSA in late 1973; in reality they formally resigned in February 1974.

Witchhunt at Mahwah

plant freely, abusing their privileges as officers, to campaign in the plant.

The Reilly group lost no time taking advantage of this "opportunity." The third leaflet to appear was signed by them (incumbents had also been seen passing out the second "UAP" leaflet) and it claimed that the leadership, in the space of a couple of days, had run its own little check on the "facts" and discovered, much to its "shock" and "disbelief," that the charges were indeed "true"! How convenient! Just in case any member didn't draw the right conclusion, however, the Reilly group cast aside even the "UAP"'s bet-hedging apology to Resnick and told the members not to vote for *anyone* on either opposition slate in view of the "facts" that had come to light:

"KROGER, DIAMOND, RICHARDSON and others of their kind do not care about their jobs, or the union, or this Country. Their objective is to infiltrate our society and disrupt anything and everything... Stay away from the entire slates they run on. Remember, they are our enemies!"

Red-baiting smear tactics are nothing new for the Reilly group, which has systematically attempted to discredit not only its opponents, but all militants, with such smears. Caring nothing for defense of the membership's rights against the Company, Reilly's gang simply allows those who express opposition to Company practices to be labeled "reds" and fired. Reilly actively suppressed movement for a strike over such firings and excessive heat in the plant last summer, smearing the militants as reds and then allowing grievances to lapse to the point where he claimed he could do nothing about the fired vice-president of the union (not to mention hundreds of others fired or disciplined). The rapidity of his endorsement of the "UAP" charges raises serious questions as to Reilly's direct connections not only with this "group,"

...Lip Strike

"I have the feeling that our fight has affected many thousands in France. It will be talked about for a long time. It is a precedent that, well, one can never duplicate" (*Le Monde*, 31 January).

This is the same Piaget that the ex-Ligue was so excited about only a few months ago. As often happens with the ex-Ligue its blatant appetites only reveal its never-ending opportunism. Just exactly what does the Lip struggle signify for the ex-Ligue? Lip, says *Rouge*, is "workers who say no to the capitalist logic." (Supplement to *Rouge* No. 240).

With all respect to the Lip workers, who put up a good fight considering they were criminally crippled by rotten leadership, the ex-Ligue's view of them is grossly inflated. Every trade unionist who ever resisted a pay cut or unsafe working condition is saying "no to the capitalist logic." This does not make of him some sort of "unconscious communist" to be enthused over as a "new [ready-made] vanguard"; no more than tailing after the Lip workers can substitute for the building of a conscious revolutionary vanguard party in France.

Rouge concludes its mass-distribution supplement in glowing enthusiasm:

"Lip in the end means: the workers don't need the bosses to make the factories run.

"And if tomorrow, faced with rising prices, with unemployment, the workers say: we are all Lips, if the next time there are strikes they decide to run the factories without the bosses, then socialism will be within reach."

Presto! The "new vanguard" will have done it all without the impatient centrists of the ex-Ligue Communiste's having had to trouble themselves with leading the struggle to form anything so old hat as an "old" (Leninist) vanguard.

The CP-dominated CGT, for its part, declared that "every prolongation of the conflict can only jeopardize what has been acquired" (*Le Monde*, 17 January 1974) and, while heaping disgust and epithets of class collaboration on the CFDT, accepted the agreements, contented to play "see there, I told you so!"

While the CGT pot is calling the CFDT kettle black, the ex-Ligue screams that Lip is not finished, LO that the workers have shown us the way and the OCI is still wondering why there was not unity.

When the negotiators finally reached a settlement, the OCI printed a front-page cartoon of a smiling Piaget ushering the new boss through the front door of Lip, while behind Piaget stands a smug Bishop Lallier. The entire centerfold prominently displayed

a searing polemic against the "Christian" CFDT. The CFDT, says the OCI, is an organization whose "function is to create divisions in the ranks of the working class," which "must be unmasked for what it is, an agent of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement" (*Informations Ouvrières*, 6-13 February 1974).

This is, of course, all very true. But it is equally true of every reformist-led trade union—the CGT, CGC, FO, etc.—as well as of the Communist Party itself. It is significant to note that throughout the OCI's entire nine-month coverage of the Lip affair, not once did it specifically attack the role of the reformist CP misleadership! This endorsement by omission of the Stalinist bureaucrats is a consistent weakness in *Informations Ouvrières* and seems to be a keystone of the so-called "strategic united front." The attentive reader of the OCI press must suspect that, fearful of confronting the French working class with the necessity to break from the CP tradition, the OCI prefers to pander to the notion that the reformist leaderships will one day unite in firm defense of the working class.

From this we can conclude only one of two things. Either the OCI is deliberately capitulating to the present level of working-class consciousness and consciously advocating the building of reformist "unity"; or the OCI honestly believes the Pablist perspective that the ranks in fact can expect to push their reformist leadership leftward into revolutionary action. In the words of *IO*:

"If it is true that it is up to the leaders to realize unity, it is equally true that it depends on the workers and militants that the leaders realize unity."

—*Ibid.*

What must be forcefully pointed out to the working class is that class unity around a revolutionary program only happens under the hegemony of a revolutionary party and that any other kind of unity is false and fleeting.

Where the reformists leave open the illusion that working-class interests can be served under capitalism, the centrist OCI leaves open the illusion that working-class interests can be advanced under reformist leadership. Both are ways of holding back the struggle of building a conscious revolutionary vanguard.

As is illustrated by the Lip strike, what is common to all the French nominally Trotskyist groups is a lack of hard programmatic intervention in the class struggle. The willingness to fight to build this leadership is in fact the acid test for any group aspiring to build a revolutionary party in France. ■

¹ Most of the Lip workers are organized in the CFDT. French unions are not divided up by industry but instead are grouped by political tendency across industry lines. Thus the CGT, the CFDT and the CGC all had representation at Lip.

Spartacist Local Directory

BAY AREA (415) 653-4668
Box 852, Main P.O.
Berkeley, CA 94701

BOSTON (617) 492-3928
Box 188, M.I.T. Sta.
Cambridge, MA 02139

BUFFALO (716) 837-1854
Box 412, Station C
Buffalo, NY 14209

CHICAGO (312) 728-2151
Box 6471, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680

CLEVELAND (216) 651-9147
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT (313) 921-4626
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232

LOS ANGELES (213) 485-1838
Box 38053, Wilcox Sta.
Los Angeles, CA 90038

MADISON (608) 257-0662
c/o RCY
Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704

NEW HAVEN (203) 624-7015
c/o RCY
Box 1363
New Haven, CT 06505

NEW ORLEANS (504) 866-8384
Box 51634, Main P.O.
New Orleans, LA 70151

NEW YORK (212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, NY 10001

SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034
Chula Vista, CA 92012

but with the Company itself.

The Company is directly implicated because, according to an MSC press release, the "UAP" leaflets were typed on the *same typewriter* used by Company Labor Relations handouts! This has reportedly been verified by document analysis experts, and charges of Company conspiracy to interfere in the union elections have been filed with the NLRB by the MSC.

Response to red-baiting attacks such as these is an important test for any opposition. The MSC has conducted a forthright response, denouncing the attacks as pro-Company attempts to divide the workers and defending its program in a number of leaflets. The MSC has openly asserted that it is, indeed, the enemy of the companies and their government, and the opponent of all those who collaborate with them from high positions in the labor movement:

"Lisa Diamond and the other members of the Militant Solidarity Committee of Local 906 have spoken out against Ford Motor Company and the corrupt U.S. Government. We oppose the government of the Kennedys and Nixons—the government responsible for the mass murder of millions of American soldiers and Vietnamese workers and peasants in the bloody war in Southeast Asia. Yes, we call for an end to this government, and call for a new kind of government, of, by and for the working people. 'Democracy' in America means democracy for the rich and powerful—and tyranny for the workers, oppression for the blacks, starvation for the poor. We in the Militant Solidarity Committee are fighting for a different kind of 'democracy'—the right of working people to control the factories which they have paid for with their sweat and labor, the right of the workers to run their own government."

The leaflet went on to point out that "Ford Motor is afraid of the ideas of the Militant Solidarity Committee because they know that our program is a challenge to their absolute power." The response of the MSC, besides debunking as lies and slanders such nonsense as Diamond's supposed "training," presumably as a "foreign agent," during a two-and-one-half-month visit to cut cane in Cuba, has been a defense of its militant program. Having defended everything that it stood for from the beginning, the MSC is rightfully indignant: it never had anything to "hide" (unlike the cowardly "Patriots"). The membership has reportedly been generally sympathetic to the victims of the slanders and received MSC leaflets enthusiastically. Unlike the 1950's there is today no mass anti-communist sentiment to aid right-wing bureaucrats to drive militants underground or out of the unions entirely.

The UAC, on the other hand, rejected a class-struggle program in favor of bureaucratic careerism, and therefore its most militant supporters and victims of "UAP" slanders are at a loss for a response to the red-baiting. The UAC refused to join the MSC in a denunciation of the attacks and petition campaign (although individual UAC supporters were willing to sign a petition), and its only direct response to the red-baiting has been a leaflet signed only by Kroger which simply denies the charges as false. It is the UAC's reformist trade unionism which prevents a more militant or programmatic response: any attempt by Kroger, for instance, to explain the role of the U.S. Army in Vietnam would embarrass her "ally" Resnick, who is seeking office only in order to play the same class-collaborationist role as Reilly.

Such a non-response, coupled, probably, with the usual court charges against the union as well as the Company (since the UAC has no principled objection to the tactic of suing the union), will simply tend to reinforce instead of debunk the charges of "outsiders" in the union and thus encourage the anti-communists, whoever they may be. The MSC alone is attempting to turn the tables on the slanderers through a vigorous political struggle aimed at winning the membership to its program, while pointing out that the only "outsiders" who have been seeking to interfere in the elections are the Company, and possibly the "UAP."

Continued from page 1

...Pentagon War Arsenal

do with the interests of the working masses or the defense of the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, Moscow has felt compelled to defend Kissinger's latest mission, labeling reports that the negotiations had flopped a sabotage of détente. *Pravda* as quoted by *The New York Times* said:

"What are the sources of 'pessimism' of the *New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, as well as some other papers?

"Are we not witness to disguised sabotage of the development of the Soviet-American dialogue?"

—*New York Times*, 5 April

While the Brezhnev crowd is beguiled with Kissinger's sweet song of détente, Nixon has begun an altogether more earnest dialogue with his bourgeois masters, assuring them that "détente" will not take place at the expense of U.S. hegemony in nuclear weaponry. This hegemony is extremely important to the U.S. bourgeoisie. Every single president from Truman through Kennedy to Nixon has indicated he would not hesitate to launch a global nuclear war if the Soviet Union or China were to seriously upset the current status quo. Nuclear blackmail has always been the trump card of the American bourgeoisie.

Nixon and Jackson

Thus Nixon has joined hands with Senator Henry Jackson, the Kremlin's favorite anti-détente whipping boy, in pushing for accelerated development of the Trident missile-firing submarine. At the same time Nixon's new budget calls for pushing ahead with the deployment of new Navy and Air Force fighters, the F-14 and F-15, and for a \$500 million commitment to develop the B-1, a new long-range bomber to replace the obsolete B-52 (ultimately 244 B-1s are to be built at a cost of over \$11 billion).

Other new weapons systems Nixon desires, to be used as "bargaining chips" for SALT II, include a new cruise missile, new maneuverable MIRV warheads and a high-speed, highly maneuverable missile submarine to supplement the Trident. Nixon and his new Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger, also want a more "flexible" nuclear strategy, by which they mean chiefly the ability to re-target U.S. missiles on short notice (20 minutes as opposed to the 36 hours currently required) so that they can engage in "limited" nuclear war, presumably to counter a Soviet thrust into Western Europe.

The Bankruptcy of "Peaceful Coexistence"

It is in the face of this deep and united hostility of all sections of the U.S. bourgeoisie to the Soviet Union that the Kremlin bureaucrats go about prattling their "peaceful coexistence" line and counterposing the angel Nixon to satanic representatives of the "military-industrial complex" such as Henry Jackson. Instead of a program of proletarian internationalism and class struggle they offer up a series of diplomatic maneuvers with the bourgeoisie that neither guarantee the security of the Soviet Union nor advance the interests of the world proletariat.

Not one whit better are the Chinese Stalinists led by Mao Tse-Tung, who oppose U.S.-USSR "détente" and want to keep NATO strong so as to prevent the shift of Russian troops to the Sino-Soviet border area. The Soviets have responded by trying to work out a three-way deal for massive American and Japanese investment in Siberian gas and oil, which they intend as a prelude to a Soviet-Japanese bloc against China. Never has the bankruptcy of the Stalinist theory of "socialism in one

country" been so starkly revealed!

Aside from SALT II the current pet projects of the Soviet bureaucrats are the NATO-Warsaw Pact conference on troop reductions in central Europe being held in Vienna and the projected European Security Conference to be held in Geneva. Both of these conferences, like the negotiations on SALT II, are completely bogged down and promise to lead exactly nowhere.

The European Security Conference, if and when it comes off, can hardly be more than a latter-day Yalta, validating the territorial settlements of World War II (e.g., the Oder-Neisse line). That is to say, it will simply be a scrap of paper which sanctifies the present status quo.

U.S. Troops in Europe

The NATO-Warsaw Pact discussions, however, do have an interesting component—the relation of the U.S. bourgeoisie to its capitalist allies in Europe. Aside from détente, another casualty of the October War was NATO. Reflecting the view that their interests are increasingly counterposed to the Americans', the bulk of the NATO governments did not fall into step behind Washington's pro-Israel policies. Aside from Portugal, which is heavily dependent on the U.S. for arms for its colonial wars in Africa, no NATO member permitted the U.S. to ship or transship U.S. military supplies to Israel. For its part, the U.S. did not bother to consult with its allies when it placed all U.S. troops, including those under NATO command, on alert status in response to alleged Russian moves to send troops to Egypt. Since last October there has been constant bickering between the Americans and their European allies on everything from the Near East "peace settlement" to the Arab oil embargo.

SL/RCY Public Offices

BAY AREA

Wednesday } 1:00-6:00 p.m.
and Thursday }
Saturday 2:30-6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street
(near Broadway)
Oakland, California
Phone 653-4568

NEW YORK

Monday } 3:00-7:30 p.m.
through Friday }

Saturday 1:00-6:00 p.m.
260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

includes SPARTACIST

- ☐ Enclosed is \$3 for 24 Issues
☐ Enclosed is \$1 for 8 Issues

order from/pay to: Spartacist Publishing Co./Box 1377, GPO/NY, NY 10001

WORKERS VANGUARD

Hundreds of Ford workers demonstrated outside UAW Solidarity House in Detroit last November protesting the sellout contract.



Ferment in the UAW:

Committee to Fight Layoffs at Fremont GM

OAKLAND, Calif.—The General Motors Fremont plant, which makes the large Monte Carlos and Buick Regals, has recently laid off the entire second shift of passenger car production, including workers with up to six years in seniority. Only a year ago, these same workers were working up to ten hours a day, six days a week. Those laid off include all the women in the plant, as well as a large proportion of minorities and young Vietnam veterans.

The Brotherhood Caucus, an amalgam of ex-officers and careerists with a veneer of New Left rhetoric, rode into office in the Fremont UAW Local 1364 in June 1973 on the basis of an ostensibly militant stance in opposition to the incumbent Unity Team, which openly backed Woodcock's sellouts. The Brotherhood's cheering section on the ostensibly revolutionary left included the Maoist October League and Revolutionary Union. (Since then the cheering has died down, and the RU no longer supports the Brotherhood at all.) Like all fake militants who get elected on the pledge of financial reform and "membership control of the union," the Brotherhood Caucus has discovered now that it is in office it has no further need of its earlier promises. This is vividly demonstrated by the Brotherhood's total inability to provide a strategy to fight the current massive wave of layoffs in auto.

Laying Off the International

A resolution passed by the Local in February opposed preferential layoffs for any group, called the government a "tool of big business" and demanded an "industry-wide strike, linked up internationally, for shorter hours with full cost-of-living pay, to make jobs for all" (see WV No. 39, 1 March 1974). Subsequently a Committee to Fight Layoffs was set up to implement the resolution, but the Local bureaucrats have reportedly been dragging their feet on contacting other locals. At a recent UAW Sub-Council meeting in Texas attended by Local 1364 leaders, pressure was re-

portedly applied to "lay off the International." Amidst rumors about the UAW rejoining the AFL-CIO at the next convention in June, the Local bureaucracy is now attempting to quash even the most muted opposition or hint of criticism of the Woodcock regime.

Instead of pushing the position on layoffs passed by Local 1364 to other locals as instructed by the membership, the officials are pushing the International's "program" on layoffs onto the membership as instructed by the UAW bureaucracy. One week prior to the big layoff, Local President Vernon Diaz mailed a copy of Woodcock's line to all members; it called for quotas on imports of foreign cars and federal programs for this and that—in other words, total reliance on the capitalist government to solve the problem and an attack on all foreign auto workers besides. (Woodcock had earlier opposed trade quotas, but under pressure his true position is revealed.) That same week, one group of supposedly left-wing supporters of the Brotherhood Caucus issued a leaflet which opposed import quotas but failed to outline a strategy to fight layoffs. These people placed themselves in the right wing (of the Brotherhood) when they earlier called for inverse seniority in layoffs and opposed the resolution for an industry-wide strike. Diaz and shop chairman Earlie Mays have apparently become increasingly unappreciative of this group's continuing effort to provide the Brotherhood with a veneer of radical verbiage.

At a press conference on the layoffs Diaz and Mays verbally denounced the layoffs, lambasting the Company for not switching to smaller cars—another favorite ploy of International bureaucrats for getting themselves off the hook. When questioned by a WV reporter on the progress on carrying out the February strikes against layoffs resolution, Mays evaded the question but when pressed admitted that a committee was meeting on the question.

Meanwhile a group from another ad

continued on page 10

Witchhunt at Mahwah

APRIL 5—The upcoming union elections at the Mahwah, New Jersey, Ford plant (UAW Local 906) are witnessing a revival of the kind of vicious, red-baiting smear attacks on opposition candidates that were used by witchhunters in the 1950's to drive militants out of the labor movement. A mysterious group with no open supporters in the union, access to Company typewriters and voluminous sources of "background information" on its victims has been issuing slanderous leaflets over the signature "United American Patriots" in recent weeks. The attacks coincide with Company victimization of oppositionists and acts of favoritism toward the incumbent officers.

Whether the "United American Patriots" is the Company itself or a secret, right-wing, pro-Company hate group is immaterial. The actions of this group pose an undisguised, direct threat to the unions and the entire working class. As Nixon's endless tangle of Watergate conspiracies and anti-labor favors to big business is unraveled for public inspection, this group—also afraid of exposure to the light of day—hurls McCarthyite labels of "communism" from its darkened corner, thereby directly defending Nixon and all big business, not to mention Mahwah Ford itself and its helpers in the Local, the incumbent leadership of Joseph Reilly et al.

There are two opposition slates running in the elections, the United Action Caucus, with a ticket headed by a former president of the Local, Aaron Resnick, and a smaller "Militant Solidarity Committee," running a slate of three candidates for convention and sub-council delegateships, Lisa Diamond, Ron Painter and Richie Bradley. (For information on the platforms of Reilly, the UAC and MSC see WV No. 41, 29 March.) Claiming to draw on official government information on "subversives," the so-called "UAP" struck at Diamond first. According to Mahwah workers interviewed by WV, stacks of leaflets mysteriously appeared by the

time clock and on Company bulletin boards in the plant. The leaflet included the following:

"Did you know that LISA DIAMOND was a member of the Venceremos Brigade? The word Venceremos is the Spanish translation of Mussolini, used in World War II, which means 'TO KILL AMERICAN SOLDIERS'! LISA DIAMOND went to Cuba in the late 1960's at the age of 20, and was educated and trained by Soviet, Cuban and Viet Cong Communists on how to disrupt and overthrow the United States Government. . . . Her mission—TO HAVE COMMUNISM DESTROY DEMOCRACY AND THE AMERICAN SPIRIT."

(An MSC leaflet pointed out that this was an insult to all Italian and Spanish-speaking workers since "Venceremos" means "we will win"!)

Barely leaving time for the Local members to decide what they thought the "American Spirit" meant these days (eagerness to endure gas lines, endless inflation and racism, all the while living happily on a rapidly shrinking unemployment check?), the "Patriots" came out with their second leaflet, which also appeared under mysterious circumstances. It began by apologizing in advance to Aaron Resnick in case he might want to disown his supporter in the UAC, Kitty Kroger, the next victim. Kroger was denounced as an SDS member who had worked in Germany during the Vietnam war trying to "subvert" the U.S. Army. It called Kroger the "Tokyo Rose of West Berlin." Finally, it concluded with a strong insinuation that Sandy Richardson, another UAC supporter, was a member of the October League, a Maoist group.

One day later, Kroger was "bumped" to night shift and given one of the hardest jobs in the plant by management. Diamond had earlier been threatened with disciplinary action; MSC candidate Painter was disciplined and UAC supporter Gregory Tucker was suspended for campaigning in the plant. Supporters of the incumbent Reilly slate, meanwhile, have been allowed to roam the

continued on page 10